



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BRIEF MENTION.

On the anniversary of JEBB's lamented death I took in hand again his *Bacchylides* which I had laid aside to pay my brief and hurried tribute to his memory (A. J. P. XXVI 491). That tribute was sadly inadequate, but of one thing I do not repent me, the Bacchylidean verses with which I prefaced what I had to say: ἀρετὰ δ' ἐπίμοχθος μὲν τελευταθείσα δ' ὀρθῶς ἀνδρὶ καὶ εὖτε θάνη λείπει πολυζήλων εὐκλείας ἄγαλμα. True, Bacchylides seems to have had the spirit of prophecy when he sang in the same ode: εὖ δὲ λαχὼν Χαρίτων πολλοῖς τε θαυμασθεῖς βροτῶν αἰῶν' ἔλυσεν, and these apt verses were duly quoted by another admirer in commemoration of the departed scholar. But I was thinking rather of the words of Bourget in L'Étape: L'idée de l'effort s'associe trop aisément dans les âmes délicates à l'idée de mérite; elles sont toujours tentées de se mésestimer de ce qui leur plaît et de s'estimer de ce qui leur coûte; and JEBB's *âme délicate* would have valued the ἀρετὰ ἐπίμοχθος. The scholar's life is a laborious one; and though no one envies the reputation of a Joannes Philoponos, Jack All-Work, the surname is the surname of our tribe. Those who see new paths, who explore new paths, must work hard. ἰδίᾳς ὁδοὺς ζητοῦσι φιλόπονοι φύσεις. Patience has well been called 'inspiration in detail', and the keener the intellect, the quicker the imagination, the more total the surrender to the great obligation of patient toil, and the greater the pride in the fulfilment of the primary duty.

My marginal notes on JEBB's *Bacchylides* are hardly worthy of a place even in the *capharnaum* of *Brief Mention*. Here and there another Pindaric parallel, here and there a divergent syntactical interpretation, here and there a mild protest, here and there an expression of pleasure at confirmations of my own judgment, not infrequently ready acceptance of tacit corrections and suggestions. Tacit, for Jebb seldom mentions other workers in the same field. In his special domain a man of his direct vision owed nothing to anyone; and his happy phrasings have made his commentaries a storehouse of observations, to which annotators gladly refer, sometimes for phenomena, which in less perfect statement have long been the common property of Hellenists. So the reviewer in the *Spectator* of Dec. 16, 1905, whom I like to think of as one and indivisible in fallibility (A. J. P. XXVI 490) called attention to JEBB's subtlety in emphasizing the dual in Pind. P. 1, 94 whereas the significance of the dual in a dialect that does not favor the dual is something that lies quite

on the surface. One must know in order to praise aright. But this reminds me that JEBB (p. 19) expresses a decided dissidence from my views on this passage, where I suggest—it was a mere suggestion—that *λογίους* may refer to panegyrists. 'It is more than doubtful', he says, 'whether there is any reference to panegyric oratory; and it seems certain that there is none to the art of rhetoric?' But rhetoric must have been an art even in the days of Pindar, and granting that the *τέχνη* of Teisias was not published in the life-time of Pindar, a written *τέχνη* presupposes an oral *τέχνη*, presupposes a school of long duration, and nothing would seem to be more natural than that Pindar should utter a note of protest against the new lights of rhetoricians, who were fast becoming formidable rivals. It is rather singular that Isokrates, who is often paralleled with Pindar (A. J. P. XXVI 238), should have been a follower of the Sicilian school, and should have proclaimed the triumph of an art that Pindar on this theory should at most have tolerated. In the only two passages in Pindar (P. 1, 94 and N. 6, 45), in which *λόγιος* is certain, we are not forced to take it in the Herodotean sense of 'chronicler', and although *λόγιος*, 'eloquent', has no warrant before Euripides, the assumption of the meaning in Pindar removes a serious difficulty in the interpretation of *λογίσιον* in N. 6, 45. *λόγος*, as we all know, is a post-Homeric word and Pindar's use of it is very suggestive.

No sooner does a fresh number of the Journal come out than I find myself confronted with blunders that have escaped not only my eyes but sharper eyes than mine; and the fair pages of JEBB's *Bacchylides* are not free from vagaries of the types and slips of the pen which may serve to comfort those who are greatly guilty of the like. Being myself given to 'heterophasy' a better word than Richard Grant White's 'heterophemy' (A. J. P. XXI 229) the substitution of 'Theseus' for 'Aegeus', p. 230, l. 6 from bottom, was no surprise. So Schmidt in his *Synonymik* says that Homer uses *χρή* only once; he meant *δεῖ*. In the first edition of his *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*, Christ puts the scene of Plato's Phaedrus on the banks of the Cephissus; he meant the Ilissus. And just so, A. J. P. XXVI 242, l. 5, I wrote 'Acharnian' when I meant 'Megarian'. A determined quest of such things will reveal mistakes in almost any book, and I note only those that attracted my attention for other reasons. So p. 89, l. 11, for XV read V; on 3, 58 for XVII read XVI (A. J. P. XXIV 483); on 5, 102 for 265 read 365; on 18, 11 for O. read P. This last mistake is very familiar to me in my own practice, and a valued correspondent from the other end of the world has called my attention to the same error, A. J. P. XXVII 206, l. 1 where for O. read P., a false reference repeated from S. C. G. § 310. In the Vocabulary under *ὁπότε* read I. 33, *ὁππότε*.

JEBB's translation of *Bacchylides* suggests pages of admiring comment. His deft touch brings to the consciousness of other translators the thumbness, so to speak, of their fingers, and the bits of Pindar that he has rendered fill me with rueful admiration. In my Greek Syntax (§ 442) I have appealed to JEBB against the wooden uniformitarianism of the usual renderings of the optative with *ἄν* (A. J. P. XIV 499). That he should have translated *σεμνάν* 'stately' (16, 109), was a decided comfort to me in view of the counter-opinion of my good friend, J. H. Heinrich Schmidt, the synonymist (A. J. P. VII 467); and I was pleased to see (on B. I, 29) that he admitted the possibility of *εὐδείελον*'s meaning 'sunny' in Pindar O. I, 111, especially as I waxed lyrical when I saw Kronion 'bathed in sunlight' and remembered my interpretation of the passage (Atl. Monthly, May, 1897). And yet dissent at points is inevitable; and no matter how well graced the actor, one interprets Shakespeare for oneself. To one who tries to look at a language face to face, translation is a hindrance as well as a help; and the happy rendering of an imaginary difference is no proof of the difference (A. J. P. XIX 231). A disputed point in syntax is not to be settled in that way; and as great a man as Gottfried Hermann fooled himself as well as others by his Latin renderings of the moods (A. J. P. II 480). Of course, when JEBB lends the charm of his diction to an interpretation that I cannot accept, I am exceeding sorrowful, but I cannot believe that he is right in his adoption of Wilamowitz's understanding of Timotheos' *ἄπιστον ἀγκάλισμα κλυσιδρομάδος αὔρας*. 'Who treacherously embraces me while the breeze sweeps over thy surges' is admirably Timothean, and it is fair to say that this version has ample support from translators that are more gifted in expression than I am and less dependent on syntax; but I still contend that the obvious translation is the right one (see A. J. P. XXIV 234).

To the literature of the section on Ceos (p. 4), I would add the interesting article of Professor Manatt, 'Bacchylides and his native isle', in the Atlantic Monthly for March, 1898. On p. 64 we read that 'Bacchylides is peculiarly prone to bestow two or more epithets on the same person'. But the double epithets belong to the lyric sphere, and Pindar does not disdain them so that the point would be brought out more clearly by a few figures such as Fraccaroli has given us on Bacchylides' use of epithets in his *Bacchilide*, *Rivista di Filologia*, 1898, p. 89—duly noted by his adoring disciple, TACCONE (p. xl), whose *Bacchilide* (Torino, Loescher), is laid on my table even while I am writing this notice. On p. 85 'Pindar neglects "position" more often than Bacchylides and Simonides do, coming nearer in this respect to the practice of Attic tragedy'. *Distinguendum est*. Breyer has shown that in the lengthening of vowels before mutes

and liquids Pindar's dactylo-epitrites approach very closely to Homeric usage, whilst the logaoedic and paeonian strophes deviate from that standard and approach the Attic norm, just as the proportion of imperfects and aorists varies according to the metres (A. J. P. IV 162). An observation of this kind is ample reward for much wearisome tabulation, and I am not perturbed by the *obiter dictum* of a classical master now much in vogue as an essayist: 'Grammar does not help one to understand an author or to appreciate a style'. On 3, 5: The remark that Pindar in O. 5, 18 has 'Ἀλφειὸν εἰρὴν ῥέοντα, but elsewhere dispenses with an epithet for the famous river would have gained in interest, if he had noted this as another of the many little things that serve to cast suspicion on the Pindaric origin of the poem. On 5, 13: 'κλεινός, though we have just had κλεινάν, a strong example of verbal repetition which the change of dialectic form scarcely palliates'. He should have added 'to modern taste'. See Schroeder's Prolegomena to Pindar, 43. Our mania for ποικιλία, which has come down to us in a straight line from Cicero, as Cicero's mania had come down to him from Isokrates and Plato, is a second nature. It is boldly proclaimed by the spokesman of the translators of the Authorized Version and asserts itself at every turn down to our own day. The English essayist to whom I have just referred quotes, 'Cleanse the stuff'd bosom of the perilous stuff that weighs upon the heart', and straightway exclaims: 'How careless the repetition of "stuff'd" "stuff" in that line'; and reading Ar. Ran. 234, 247 one wonders what modern poet would have dared to repeat so vivid an epithet as ἔνυδρον in the space of fifty words. On 5, 48: 'The historic present here is unusual but intelligible'. If, as I contend, the historic present is excluded from Pindar, we have an interesting point of difference, over which, by the way, TACCONE becomes enthusiastic. On 5, 110: Jebb writes εἰσάνταν μόλοι and says 'εἴσαντ' ἂν μόλοι could be explained only as an archaizing imitation of the Homeric ὄς κε with optative'. There is a similar passage in Pindar P. 9, 129 which cannot be got rid of by the simple process that changes εἴσαντ' ἂν into an analogical εἰσάνταν. On 5, 161: προσιδεῖν, 10, 23: περόντα and 16, 43: ἰδεῖν, there are elaborate notes on the aorists which all fall into the vast category of the negative. 16, 43 Bacchylides says: οὐ γὰρ ἂν θέλοιμ' ἰδεῖν φάος (neg.), Eur. I. T. 608: φῶς ὁρᾶν θέλω (pos.). So each man goes his own way. Smyth simply expects ὁρᾶν, Jebb amply explains ἰδεῖν, and the mechanical soul of the statistician impales the winged word and puts it with the other specimens in his butterfly show-case. There are a few of them in S. C. G. § 246. 16, 64: αἶ κε solitary in Bacchylides does not occur in Pindar. 17, 42: ὄφρα only here is a marked contrast to Pindar with whom ὄφρα is the regnant final particle. In such matters as these Mrose de syntaxi Bacchylidea is of little help. Mrose is content to say that Bacchylides deliberately avoided the less usual features of Pindaric syntax, but one longs for something more definite. One would like to know how

the two poets differ in the extent of their practice. So, for instance, as to the intrusion of the preposition between adjective and substantive or substantive and adjective; and as Jebb was a subtle interpreter of syntactical effects, the regret comes back so often expressed at the time of his death that he had not given us a Pindar from which the world might have learned to appreciate the sheen of the plumage as well as the sharpness of the talons of the Theban eagle.

JEBB did noteworthy service for Pindar in his famous essay, but even he could hardly have stemmed the tide that is making away from the poet. Read the characteristics quoted, A. J. P. XXVI 115, 360. Read the characteristic in *Die Hellenische Kultur*, a book recently noticed in this Journal. Read the characteristic in WILAMOWITZ'S *Griechische Literatur*; and WILAMOWITZ knows his Pindar as few do, whatever may be thought of Mahaffy and Murray. And now comes Professor EDUARD SCHWARTZ, and begins the summary of his final judgment of Pindar in his *Charakterköpfe aus der antiken Literatur* (Teubner) thus: 'Pindar ist weder ein reicher noch ein gefälliger Dichter'. Assuredly, these judgments are not calculated to win students for a poet, of whom I myself have said: 'There is an aristocratic disdain in his nature that yields only to kindred spirits or to faithful service'. True, Professor SCHWARTZ may fairly protest that he has warned professionals off the course of popular lectures, in which he has rendered his verdict, but Professor SCHWARTZ is too important a scholar for anything that he writes to be negligible, and this booklet has not been neglected, for it has reached a second edition in a comparatively short time. Now no one can have a greater distrust of popular lectures than a man who has been guilty of some scores of them in his day. The task of a popularizer is a difficult one, and it is hard to keep a just mean between talking down to one's audience and shooting over the heads of the same. The French are past masters in the art of the *conférencier*, and other nationalities toil after them in vain. Whoever heard the late eminent historian, Mr. Freeman, lecture to American audiences, cannot fail to recall some of the many illustrations he gave unwittingly of Lowell's famous essay 'On a certain condescension in foreigners'. If we had been children in the nursery, he could not have got down more decidedly on his intellectual all-fours, as he hammered away at the story of the three Englands, and unfolded the mystery of the *Oyez!* of the courts. And I remember another lecturer of less name and fame, who brought out with great gravity and impressiveness the beggarly elements of the phonetics of English style before students, who had made themselves familiar with Dionysius De Compositione. Shooting over the heads of an audience is a serious fault. Underrating the intelligence of an audience is worse. No specialist ought to emerge from the depths to which

he has dived without bringing up something rich and strange out of the full fathom five. A popular lecture from which a fellow-student can learn nothing is a poor affair; and I am content to learn from Professor SCHWARTZ.

The close texture of Professor SCHWARTZ's style has for me a certain fascination. It demands more concentrated attention than one would expect of lectures intended for a popular audience, and in his second preface he himself says that he has here and there made his language 'leichter und flüssiger'. It is what may be called an anagnostic style, and yields more, the more it is pondered, and so too it may be said that the more one brings to the study of the matter, the more one takes away. Of the contrasted 'heads' he has brought before us, my chief interest lies in the 'Hesiod und Pindar' for obvious reasons, and for one not so obvious. His 'Hesiod und Pindar' recalls with a pang my neglect to make a thorough comparative study, a *cum pulvisculo exhaurire* study, as Ritschl used to say, of the two poets for the illustration of my edition of the Olympians and Pythians, a neglect which I tried to make good, years afterwards, by assigning the task to one of my pupils, JOHN ADAMS SCOTT, whose paper presents a well-ordered material for the study of the subject, which I should have been glad to have, when my work was going on; and I cannot help thinking that it was ungracious in Professor PEPPMÜLLER to say, as he did in the *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie*, 1 Nov., 1899, that SCOTT's dissertation, despite its diligent collection of facts, would yield little to a man who had made a special study of the subject, the man in his mind being PEPPMÜLLER himself, who was naturally nettled at having been anticipated, as most of us would have been. Not to summarize SCOTT's dissertation, one interesting fact comes out very distinctly that whenever Homer and Hesiod differ, Pindar as a rule leans to the home poet, so that there seems to be after all, a bond of union between the Peasant Prophet and the Nobleman (not to say 'Junker') Poet. For Professor SCHWARTZ's purpose the contrast is the main thing, and this is quite in accordance with the general scope of the *Charakterköpfe*, which is to do justice to the individual element so often merged in the vague terms 'classical', 'Greek', 'Roman'. We are apt to emphasize the type too much, important as the type is. Strangers see likeness where members of the family fail to discern it; and it is because we are more or less strangers that we fail to distinguish the lines of difference in the style, in the handwriting of foreigners. One of my German critics amused me very much, twenty years ago, by finding a certain likeness between my work and Rutherford's. If Rutherford's eye ever fell on that paragraph, his growl must have been something portentous, to judge by the rumble of his recent book on the Aristophanic scholia which swells into a roar, as he deals damnation on the

Greek rhetoricians of a later day. Of course, Matthew Arnold's postulate of personality in the single line is strained, but there is an undeniable fascination as well as possible profit in the search; and such a search gives zest even to the study of indexes, for which I confess a decided weakness (A. J. P. XVI 525, XXVI 236). The other day I was looking up ὅδε in Forman's Index to Deinarchos, to complete my study of that demonstrative in the orators. According to Forman, Deinarchos does not use ὅδε in any form. I have not verified the statement, but I trust Forman all the more because Deinarchos was a Corinthian, and Fick maintains (Ilias VII) that the Corinthians showed a partiality for οὗτος where ὅδε seems to be imperative. To be sure, some of the other orators use ὅδε very little, but one likes to think of the κρίθινος Δημοσθένης as sticking to the ways of his great birthplace, if indeed these were the ways of his great birthplace. Why should that be more unnatural than that Pindar should use the Corinthian form Ποτειδάν in an ode for a Corinthian? But unfortunately a little investigation has shown Fick's generalization to be more than doubtful and Corinthian οὗτος must join Lokrian τε (A. J. P. IX 410), and Arkadian ἔστε (A. J. P. XXIV 389), into which I was seduced by Plato's ἴττω Ζεύς.

But ἴττω Ζεύς takes us back to the cantonal type to which both Hesiod and Pindar were subject. After all, they were both Boeotians; and in my Introductory Essay to Pindar and elsewhere (A. J. P. XVI 373), I have had a good word to say for the Boeotians and for Boeotia, not untaught of Bergk (L. G. I 715), not untouched by sympathy with the underdogs of history, not unlessoned by the experience of life. Indeed, I have even gone so far as to try to explain the attitude of Pindar and his canton during the Persian War. That was twenty years after our war was over, and it will hardly be believed that in 1885 I received a friendly intimation that it would be more prudent for me to screen the parallel lines and to efface the sentence: 'A little experience of a losing side might aid historical vision'. I have lived to see a more tolerant day, and I too have become more tolerant of divergent estimates of Pindar and in that spirit of toleration, I will finish my quotation from Professor SCHWARTZ in which he is not so unjust, after all, to the last champion of Dorism, the last true believer in Herakles. To the Cynics, Herakles was but a lay figure.

Der Kreis seiner Gedanken ist streng geschlossen, der Pomp seiner Sprache steif, die Formen seiner Poesie konventionell, die Sache der er diene war längst nicht mehr lebendig und berechtigt zu dauern. Wenn aber der echte Dichter darin sich kund gibt, dass seine Rede nach Jahrhunderten und Jahrtausenden den verstehenden Leser zwingt ihn zu verehren und zu lieben als sei er noch ein lebenswarmer Mensch, dann ist er der echtsten einer gewesen. In seinen Gedichten lebt er weiter als das wozu er geboren wurde und was er sein wollte, als ein Edelmann von Gottes Gnaden.

As I read this over I find that I have forgiven the opening sentence, and I cannot suppress my satisfaction that Professor SCHWARTZ like Wilamowitz has not flicked away Pindar's claim to be an Aigeid, even if it should prove to be as unsubstantial as some of our American pretensions to aristocracy. The belief suffices as it has sufficed. ἐμοὶ παρέpes has always meant so much to some people.

All this is lamentably personal, no doubt, but the predominance of the first person in *Brief Mention* is not only a part of the game (A. J. P. XXV 490); it is due in good measure to the growing conviction of the writer that blank impersonality is a deadly foe to the vitality of our studies, so that I am somewhat remorseful at having taken Mr. SHARPLEY to task for his self-assertion, and I rejoice greatly that in the absence of American enthusiasm (A. J. P. XXVII 228), Mr. SHARPLEY can console himself with the plaudits of Continental critics. So Herr WEBER (*N. P. Rundschau*, 3. Nov. 1906) actually rebukes my poor old contemporary VAN HERWERDEN for noticing MAZON'S *Peace* in his *Vindiciae Aristophaneae*, which he might not have done, if the French editor had not presented his work to the venerable scholar, while not noticing SHARPLEY'S *Peace*, as if he had had ample time to do so; for, according to Herr WEBER, SHARPLEY'S *Peace*, is recognized by the critics as the best of all. And VAN LEEUWEN in his *Pax*, which has appeared since, though he does not refer to SHARPLEY, sustains him in that all important interpretation of ὁ κατὰ τοῖν σκελοῖν (v. 241). If κατὰ τοῖν σκελοῖν could be considered reflexive, and Polemos afflicted with the same laxness that befalls so many of the followers of Polemos, why then τιλῶν, not τιλῶν ποιῶν could readily be supplied, and one would have less difficulty in accepting this ladleful of the σκῶρ ἀείνων of the scholiasts, 'the nonsense and nastiness', as Rutherford calls it, 'generated from silly and undisciplined minds' (A Chapter in the History of Annotation, p. 388). Mr. SHARPLEY'S attitude then is perfectly correct. 'Oftimes nothing profits more than self-esteem'. To finish the quotation would be to spoil it. 'The first person', as has been remarked (A. J. P. XXIII 7), 'is to a certain extent vulgar in Greek, and we are not surprised that the vulgarian Aischines is given to an undue use of the personal pronoun outside of the consecrated range. Is it not "better form" in our world to suppress "I" in favor of the colorless "one", in favor of the impersonal passive'? But if one feels strongly, if one thrills to the fingertips? In Lysias I, unrivalled masterpiece of ἡθοποιία, the betrayed husband is freer with his ἐγώ's than the traitor, Aischines, as we may call him for the sake of the antithesis and for the sake of Demosthenes; and as a matter of style, let us heed what Herbert Spencer says in *Facts and Comments*, p. 98: 'Whether the endeavor to sink the personal in the impersonal by using the expression "it is believed", instead of "I believe",

<or "it has been remarked", instead of "I have remarked"> is a trait of good style may be doubted; since there is given to the reader's mind a certain needless task in substituting the real meaning for the meaning expressed'. However, A. J. P. is a convenient substitute for the offensive capital letter.

W. A. M.: Housman's introduction to his *Manilius* (London, 1903) is pungent reading and is good discipline for any man who is bold enough to write a book for his enemy. And yet in spite of the Ishmaelitic tone of the work and the savage, nay barbarous, criticism of his predecessors and contemporaries, there are bitter truths expressed therein that are enlivened by a grim and mordant humor. Bentley, Housman says, was impatient, was tyrannical, was too sure of himself, and treated the MSS much as if they were fellows of Trinity. And the "Scientific critic unlike the rest of mankind contrives to enjoy the usually incompatible luxuries of shirking his work and despising his superiors". Housman's remarks on the conservative, because incompetent, character of the latest criticism as distinguished from the wise audacity of Lachmann and Madvig, are well worth reading. But why may not the truth be spoken in love? When one bears testimony against an evil generation it is not well to prejudice the message by arousing the old Adam in the reader, and Housman is wonderfully successful in that. "The simple process of opening one's mouth and shutting one's eyes has been dignified by the title of 'eine streng wissenschaftliche Methode', but rational criticism has been branded with a term of formal reprobation". Let no man say that in our effete age the odium philologicum has passed away so long as Mr. Housman abides with us.¹

A CORRECTION.

In the last number of this Journal (p. 318, lines 21, ff.), I said that the discussion of Malevole's relationship to the melancholy Jaques had recently been "revived", and referred in my note to Dr. E. E. Stoll's article on "Shakspeare, Marston, and the Malcontent Type", *Modern Philology*, Vol. III, pp. 281, ff.

I used the word "revived" because I recollected, as I thought, that Dr. Stoll had, in his own article, referred to some previous discussions of his subject. This, however, is not the case. The credit of the discovery belongs entirely to Dr. Stoll, and my apologies for the mistake are due both to him and to the readers of this Journal.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

¹ This mordancy seems to have grown on Mr. Housman since the date of his contributions to the *Journal* IX 316 foll., XIII 139 foll. in which the Pramnean wine of his criticism is not unduly tart. Fortunate are those in whom the bitterness of life does not generate bitterness of temper *σφόδρ' ἐστὶν ἡμῶν ὁ βίος οἶνῳ προσφερέης· ὅταν ἡ τὸ λοιπὸν μικρὸν, ὄξος γίνεται.*—B. L. G.